

CATALAN SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW, 7: 1-8 (2017)  
[Secció de Filosofia i Ciències Socials](#), IEC, Barcelona  
ISSN: 2014-6035  
DOI: 10.2436/20.3000.02.33  
<http://revistes.iec.cat/index/CSSr>

## Antonius Andreae, Catalan disciple of Duns Scotus<sup>1</sup>

Jaume Mensa i Valls\*

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

### Original source:

***Revista de Catalunya*, 291: 26-36 (2015)**

(<http://www.revistadecatalunya.cat/ca/index.asp>)

Translated from Catalan by Mary Black

“Antonius Andreae could be satisfied:  
with his commentary Scotism received a perfect tool for propagation of its philosophy,  
which could then effectively compete with other schools  
until the end of the Middle Ages and beyond it.”

M. Gensler (1997: 50)

### 1. Revindication of Antonius Andreae

The works of Antonius Andreae († ante 1333) played a very prominent role in the formation and dissemination of Scotism. Proof of this is the more than 100 manuscripts conserved in libraries around Europe, along with around 30 editions issued between 1471 and 1520 by the best printers in Naples, Bologna, Venice, Strasbourg, Paris and London, for example. It is difficult to find a minimally important university library from that period that does not have at least one copy of some incunabula by this Catalan author. Without Andreae's clarity, capacity for synthesis, methodological rigour and systematising mindset, Scotism would not have become one of the great mediaeval schools of philosophy, or at least it would have been quite different. Therefore, Andreae has accurately been regarded as the “second founder of Scotism” (C. Bérubé 1979: 387).

The purpose of this article is to sketch the intellectual profile of Antonius Andreae within the context of Scotist thinking and to present his contribution to the history of philosophy.

### 2. The master: John Duns Scotus

In a heavily commented *Syllabus* from 1277, Bishop S. Tempier of Paris condemned 219 philosophical theses. Ultimately, this sentence questioned to

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is the outcome of the research projects entitled “Corpus Digital de la Ciència a la Corona d'Aragó i el seu context llatí i romànic: Arnau de Vilanova”, MCI, FFI2011-29117-CO2-02 (FILO); and “Corpus Digital d'Arnau de Vilanova: Filosofia i ciència a la Corona d'Aragó (segles XIII-XIV)”, MEC, FFI2014-53050-C5-2-P.

\* Contact address: Jaume Mensa. [Departament de Filosofia](#), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Campus de la UAB. 08193 Bellaterra, EU. E-mail: [Jaume.Mensa@uab.cat](mailto:Jaume.Mensa@uab.cat).

what extent the Christian faith could accept Aristotle's thinking (interpreted by the Muslim commentators Averroes and Avicenna). Philosophically, the 13th century signalled the full recovery of the Aristotelian corpus, while theologically, it heralded the development of sweeping syntheses between Aristotelian philosophy and Christian theology. The main exponent of this line of thinking is Thomas Aquinas (†1274). Following the Aristotelian model of science, the so-called *Doctor Communis* turned the traditional sapiential theology into a fully-fledged scholastic, academic *scientia*, that is, into a kind of knowledge grounded upon primary principles (the science of God and the saints) known by faith, based on which the theologian used human reason to deductively draw conclusions. The pathway of (Aristotelian) philosophy lead to the doorway of faith.

After the 1277 Syllabus, the theologians clearly understood that Aristotle's first unmoved mover was not unequivocally the trinitarian God revealed in the Bible. A chasm opened between the two that only faith could cross. In this context, John Duns Scotus (†1308) redefined the meaning of theology and reviewed the possibility of knowing God through human reason. To Scotus, theology was no longer that deductive, eminently theoretic and abstract *scientia* which operated following the laws of Aristotelian logic but instead a reflection on the revelation, that is, on historical – and therefore contingent – events, such as the creation and the incarnation. Theology, Scotus claims in *Lectura*, “is properly called wisdom, not science” (J. D. Escot 2000: 148). It is a historical theology, one that is more experiential and focused on the Gospel, Christ-centric. Human reason, metaphysics, cannot know God: the first object of metaphysics is no longer God (Thomas Aquinas) but the being and its properties. Philosophy cannot demonstrate any supernatural truth.

The thinking of Scotus, the *Doctor Subtilis*, is acute, penetrating and insightful. Yet it is also complex, difficult and intricate. In reality, Scotus died when he was relatively young (around 40 years old) and his work and thinking were still working towards ever more successful formulations. His writings seem unfinished and fragmentary (J. A. Merino 1993: 181). Scotus' first disciples (William of Alnwick, Alfred Gonter, Francis of Mayrone, John of Bassolis, Francis of Marchia and Antonius Andreae) undertook the task of turning the master's fertile, promising intuitions into a real systematic, organised, well-rounded body of thinking. And prominent among them is the name of Antonius Andreae, rightly nicknamed *Doctor Scotellus*. Viewed as a whole, Andreae's work is a complete course in philosophy (logic, natural philosophy, metaphysics) *ad mentem Scoti*. Andreae did not set out to write a work that was original and genuine in the modern sense of the word; instead, as he himself often said at the end of some books, “I am following the doctrine of the subtle Doctor, whose fame and memory is blessed, inasmuch as he, by his sacred and profound doctrine, has filled and made resound the whole world, namely John Duns Scotus, who was of the Scottish nation, and of the Minorite religion. [...] Reader, if you find something well said in this work, you will know that it emanates from the profundity of his doctrine and of his knowledge. But if you find something less well said, or in any way contradicting his doctrine, put it down to my inexperience.” (A. Andreae 1892: 600).

Therefore, it should come as no surprise that from the very start, Andreae's treatises have been confused with Scotus', and that they have often been published together. One century ago, critics took invaluable steps to

discern each of their works; however, much remains to be done. Establishing a list of their unquestionably authentic writings is not only a necessary step to faithfully reconstruct his thinking; it is also indirectly essential in order to know the master's thinking by contrast.

### 3. Antonius Andreae: Biographical information

There is little known biographical information on Antonius Andreae. The main source of information is the colophons of the oldest manuscripts. We are sure that he was a Franciscan from the Province of Catalonia and the Custody of Lleida. This is stated in numerous codices, such as one of the oldest ones from the Library of the Archive of the Cathedral of Pamplona: ms. 6, fs. 20 and 59 (1333-1335). Andreae taught within the geographic area of the Custody of Lleida. Some manuscripts, such as the one from the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin: ms. Theol. lat. qu. 32, f. 244 (15th century) reports that Andreae was a lecturer of natural philosophy in the Montsó convent. This information fits perfectly with the fact that Andreae was from the Custody of Lleida, because according to a list from 1334, this Custody was comprised of the convents of Lleida, Tarragona, Tortosa, Montblanc, Montsó, Cervera, Tàrrrega and Morella (P. Sanahuja 1959: 65). Some manuscripts call him a doctor or doctor in theology. He was eventually nicknamed *Doctor Dulcissimus*, *Dulcifluus* and *Fundatissimus* (F. Ehrle 1919: 48 and 55). Based on some of Andreae's own statements, one can deduce that he was a disciple of Scotus: "These are from the sayings of master brother John Duns, of the Scottish nation, occupying the master's chair, as far as I have been able to collect them into one [work]" (Library of the Archive of the Cathedral of Pamplona, codex 6, f. 87). Therefore, he was an *auditor Scoti* (Ambrosian Library of Milan, ms. A, 69 Inf). Based on the way he is recalled by the copyist of the manuscript of Pamplona, which dates from 1333, he seems to have been recently deceased. Besides these known dates, all kinds of speculations, deductions and assumptions have been made which shall not be mentioned in this article.

Andreae is the author of the *Scriptum in artem veterem*, the *Tractatus quaestionum de principiis naturae* and more importantly the *Scriptum super Metaphysicam Aristotelis* (although a careful examination of the textual tradition of the latter title is needed). He is also plausibly attributed authorship of a *Quaestio de subiecto totius logicae* and several *Quaestiones extraordinariae novae logicae*. His authorship of the following works is more problematic: the *Commentarium in IV libros Sententiarum*, the *Compendiosum principium in libros Sententiarum*, several *Sermons*, the *Tractatus de syllogismo demonstrativo et topico*, the *Quaestiones super libros de anima* and even other texts (M. Gensler 1992).

### 4. Native of Tauste?

Regarding his specific place of birth, scholars have suggested two cities: Barcelona and Tauste. Following a chronicle by Àngel Vidal accredited by "ancient manuscripts" (now lost), the 18th-century historian Jaume Coll (1738: 161) claimed that Antonius Andreae came from Barcelona's Sant Francesc convent. In this case, he would be a Barcelona native. Martí de Barcelona (1929: 325) revisited and accepted this explanation, but since then it has not gained

any more followers. The weak point of what we can call the Barcelona hypothesis is that there is no documentation to back it, and it does not justify why a friar from Barcelona would end up in the Custody of Lleida.

The Tauste hypothesis gained ground in the 20th century, even among Catalan historians and reference works. The fact that the famous *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge. Bio-Bibliographie* (U. Chevalier 1905), which has been published several times, claims him clearly contributed significantly to this shift. So where does this hypothesis come from? On what documentary evidence is it grounded? The Aragonese historian F. de Latassa (1796) reported on it back in the 17th century, but the origin of the information can be found in books by two scholars from Tauste, the Jesuit Juan López de Arbizu and the Franciscan Basilio Iturri de Roncal. The former, in an *Aprobación* from a book by the latter, from 1722, listed the important men of Tauste, among them Antonius Andreae. Juan López de Arbizu also wrote a monograph, unpublished and currently lost, entitled *Compendio de los ilustres hijos de la villa de Tauste y otros recuerdos de esta antigua, noble y leal población*. Two years later, in 1724, in a monograph dedicated to the Virgin of Sancho Abarca, Iturri de Roncal recalls the “sons” of this Virgin. One of the prominent ones was Andreae, “Taustian from the old houses of the Andreses” (1729 and 1864: 53). However, they provide no documentation or proof but instead base their statements merely on matching surnames. Before these two authors from Tauste had done so, we can find no other scholar who associated the name of Andreae with Tauste. When talking about Antonius Andreae, Blasco de Lanuza, José Ximénez Samaniego, José Antonio de Hebrera and Juan de S. Antonio or the *Cronista Andrés* never mention the name of Tauste. If the case for Barcelona is lacking documentation (even though Àngel Vidal claims to have seen it), so is the case for Tauste. If it is difficult to explain why a Franciscan from Barcelona would end up in the Custody of Lleida (even though relations between the two custodies was common), it is even more of a stretch to justify his coming from Tauste, a village which had no Franciscan convent during Andreae’s lifetime.

Today there is still no documentary or critical basis for continuing to assert that Andreae hailed from Tauste. What we know for sure, both actively and passively, is that Antonius Andreae was from the Custody of Lleida. The fact that the known documentation presents him as a Franciscan from the Province of Aragon (which at that time covered the entire Crown of Aragon) or as a lecturer from the Montsó convent (which belonged to the Custody of Lleida) should confuse no one. And yet they seem to have been the source of many mistakes.

## 5. Antonius Andreae and “Scotist Aristotelianism”

More than anything else, Duns Scotus was a theologian. His main treatises are commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, the book used as a text in theology faculties. His strictly philosophical writings either date from his youth or are unfinished or minor. What is more, from a formal standpoint, Scotus’ style requires constant effort from the reader; it contains long and sometimes rather unclear sentences with reiterations, leaps in argumentation, constant reformulations of theses, subtle distinctions and a fluctuating lexis. In contrast, thanks to the clear, precise, rigorous language of Andreae, the *Doctor*

*Dulcifluus*, Duns Scotus' acute intuitions and solid philosophical principles take on a well-structured organisation which is expressed in the guise of a commentary on the works – especially on *Metaphysics* – of the philosopher par excellence, Aristotle. Andreae is the father of what is called “Scotist Aristotelianism” (G. Pini 1995a: 387).

Indeed, Antonius Andreae wrote three philosophical treatises devoted to logic, natural philosophy and metaphysics, respectively; Duns Scotus had not written any complete work on these topics, especially the first two. The *Scriptum in artem veterem* is a set of commentaries related to the “old” logic, that is, to the treatises on Aristotelian logic known back in Boethius' era: the *Categoriae* or *Praedicamenta* and the *De interpretatione* or *Perihermeneias*; the *Isagoge* or the introduction by Porphyry (translated into Latin by Boethius) to Aristotle's *Categoriae*; Gilbert de la Porrée's *Liber sex principiorum*, a book which is also a commentary on the Aristotelian categories; and finally Boethius' *De divisionibus*, which is also a kind of commentary on the Aristotelian categories. We also know that Andreae intended to gloss the “new” logic; the *Tractatus de syllogismo demonstrativo et topico* or the *Quaestiones ordinariae de logica* are most likely related to this project. The *Tractatus quaestionum de principiis naturae* does not follow the lines of any of Aristotle's works but instead exclusively reflects on the three principles of nature: matter, form and privation. Andreae particularly bore in mind Scotus' *Quaestiones subtilissimae in Metaphysicam* and *Ordinatio*.

Andreae's most emblematic work is the *Scriptum super Metaphysicam Aristotelis*, his *opus magnum* (M. Gensler 1997; W.O. Duba 2014). It is an *expositio textualis* of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* with 91 questions interspersed over the most relevant topics. Only one manuscript of it in this form has been conserved (Oriel College, Oxford: ms. 65). The remaining manuscripts, around 50 of them, along with the 17 incunables and the subsequent printings, only reproduce the literal commentary (*Expositio in XII libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis*) or the questions (*Quaestiones super XII libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis*). Therefore, it is an extensive, ambitious work. On the one hand, the literary exposition bears in mind the work of the same name by Thomas Aquinas and draws from it, to such an extent that Andreae was accused by his adversaries of being an *imitator Aquinatis*. The treatise by Thomas Aquinas, the *expositor* par excellence of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, is the model that Andreae followed and the milestone he set out to surpass. In the essential passages, without naming him and using generic yet unequivocal formulas such as the *quidam expositor*, Andreae disputes Thomas Aquinas' interpretation and offers the Scotist alternative. It is indeed a much more comprehensive commentary than Thomas Aquinas'. On the other hand, Andreae surveyed Scotus' *Quaestiones subtilissimae in Metaphysicam*; he eliminated some questions, wrote new ones, completed existing ones and polished them and inserted them in the right place within the commentary. As a general rule, Andreae adapted the *Quaestiones* (which is an early work) to the more mature theses of *Ordinatio* and *Quodlibet*.

Andreae used the doctrine of univocity (real and consistent unity which avoids any contradiction) formulated by Scotus in the *Ordinatio* not only to interpret Aristotle's classical expression of the *ens multis modis dicitur* (being is said in many ways) but also to convert metaphysics into a unique, organic, structured *scientia transcendens* (science of the being as being and the

transcendental or common properties of the being) thanks precisely to this univocity of the concept of being. Univocity replaces the analogy (or relationship of similarity) proposed by Thomas Aquinas. When interpreting Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, the Doctor Angelicus – always according to Andreae – confuses *praedicatio* (predication) or the relationship between the concept of the being and its referents, with *attributio* (attribution), that is, real dependence among the same referents. Predication entails a *primum analogatum* (first principle): there is a relationship of proportionality between it and its referents. In contrast, attribution consists in the proportional relationship among different referents (without *primum analogatum*). When Aristotle speaks about “analogy” in his *Metaphysics*, he is referring to *attributio* but not *praedicatio* (G. Pini 1991: 551-561; and 1995b). To Andreae, the purpose of metaphysical science is simply the being as being (*ens in quantum ens*), the common being (*ens commune*) in God and creatures. However, God per se, with his godliness and attributes, is beyond metaphysical knowledge and inaccessible to human reason. Natural theology, which Thomas Aquinas believed dealt specifically with God, no longer made any sense to Antonius Andreae: the reflection on God, or more accurately on the principle of being, is part of the general ontology. Therefore, regarding Thomas Aquinas, “Scotist Aristotelianism”, which is more pessimistic about the natural capacities of human reasoning, provides a reductionist interpretation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: the metaphysics coincides with the ontology, but conversely, and thanks to the univocity of being, it is more “scientific”.

## 6. The fate of the works of Antonius Andreae

If Andreae's objective was to outline the different philosophical disciplines *ad mentem Scoti*, he seemed to have successfully achieved this. His works were more popular than those of Scotus himself and became a basic text in Scotist teaching in late medieval and Renaissance universities. The fact that 25 manuscripts of Andreae's treatises are conserved at Oxford and Cambridge alone is telling. Andreae built the truly philosophical Scotism and made it an alternative system to Thomism. If Duns Scotus' main philosophical rival was Henry of Ghent, after Andreae's work perhaps the adversary of Scotism became Thomas Aquinas, or Thomism. It is no coincidence that afterward, Bartolommeo Spina, a prominent Thomist, wrote his *Defensiones* (Venice, 1517) of Thomas Aquinas's theses against Andreae's attacks, and that all 30 were later integrated in Thomas Aquinas's *In Metaphysicam Aristotelis commentaria* (Thomas Aquinas 1562). Therefore, in the same book, the reader had not only Thomas' commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* but also its “apparent impugnation” by Andreae (summarised by Spina) and the consequent “refutation” (also by Spina). Andreae had never mentioned Thomas Aquinas by name, but Spina repeated Andreae's name a thousand times, turning him into the arch-critic of Thomas Aquinas and Thomism.

Antonius Andreae may not be an ‘author/author’ according to the etymological meaning of the Greek word (*authéntes*), that is, “person who acts by himself”; however, without any doubt, he was an ‘author/auctor’, in the sense of the Latin word (*auctor* comes from *augere*, ‘augment’), namely a “person who grows, expands or completes another's work”. And from this

vantage point, Antonius Andree's work as a whole is a *magnum opus*, a masterpiece by a *fundatissimus* author worth knowing.

## Bibliography

- ANDREU, A. (1892), "Expositio in XII libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis", in Ioannis Duns Scoti. *Opera Omnia*, VI. Paris: Ludovico Vivès.
- BÉRUBÉ, C. (1979). "Antoine André, témoin et interprète de Scot", in *Antonianum*, 54, pp. 386-446.
- CHEVALIER, U. (1905). "Andrea (Antoine)", in *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge. Bio-Bibliographie*. Nouvelle édition refondue, corrigée et considérablement augmentée, I (A-I). Paris: Alphonse Picart et fils, coll. 229.
- COLL, J. (1738). *Chronica seráfica de la santa provincia de Cathaluña de la regular observancia de nuestro padre Francisco*. Barcelona: Imprenta de los herederos de Juan Pablo y María Martí.
- DE LATASSA Y ORTÍN, F. (1796). *Bibliotheca antigua de los escritores aragoneses que florecieron desde la venida de Christo, hasta el año 1500*, I. Zaragoza: Oficina de M. Heras.
- DUBA, W.O. (2014). "Three Franciscan Metaphysicians after Scotus: Antonius Andree, Francis of Marchia, and Nicholas Bonet", in Amerini, F.; Galluzzo, G. (eds.). *A Companion to the Latin Medieval Commentaries on Aristotle's Metaphysics*. Leiden: Brill.
- EHRLE, F. (1919). *Die Ehrentitel der scholastischen Lehrer des Mittelalters*. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- ESCOT, J. D. (2000). *Del primer principi i altres escrits*. Barcelona: Edicions 62.
- GENSLER, M. (1992). "Catalogue of Works by or ascribed to Antonius Andree", in *Mediaevalia philosophica Polonorum*, 31, pp. 147-155.
- (1997). "Antonius Andree Scotism's best supporting Auctor, II: Antonius Andree's *Opus Magnum*: The *Metaphysics* Commentary", in *Anuari de la Societat catalana de filosofia*, 9, pp. 39-50.
- ITURRI DE RONCAL, B. (1722). *Explicación de la doctrina christiana*. Zaragoza: Herederos de Diego Larvmbe.
- (1729). *Historia de nuestra Señora de Sancho Abarca, abogada de los reinos de Aragón y Navarra*. Zaragoza. There is a second edition from 1864, Zaragoza: Imprenta de José María Magallón, 1864. We are citing this second edition.
- MARTÍ DE BARCELONA [BAGUNYÀ, J.] (1929). "Fra Antoni Andree, O.M., "Doctor Dulcifluus" (s. XIV<sup>e</sup>)", in *Criterion*, 5(18), pp. 321-346.
- MERINO, J. A. (1993). *Historia de la filosofía franciscana*. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.
- PINI, G. (1991). "Una lettura scotista della *Metafisica* di Aristotele: L'*Expositio in libros Metaphysicorum* di Antonio Andree", in *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale*, 2, pp. 529-586.

— (1995a). “Scotistic Aristotelianism: Antonius Andreas' *Expositio* and *Quaestiones* on the Metaphysics”, in *Via Scoti: Methodologica ad mentem Joannis Duns Scoti*, I, overseen by L. Sileo. Rome: PAA – Edizioni Antonianum.

— (1995b). “Sulla fortuna delle *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* di Duns Scoto: le *Quaestiones super Metaphysicam* di Antonio Andrea”, in *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale*, 6, pp. 281-361.

SANAHUJA, P. (1959). *Historia de la Seráfica Provincia de Cataluña*. Barcelona: Editorial Seráfica.

THOMAS AQUINAS (1562). *Praeclarissima commentaria in duodecim libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis*, ed. B. Spinae. Venice: Apud Hieronymum Scotum.